City of Annapolis
DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD & ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS
145 GORMAN STREET, THIRD FLOOR, ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401
ANNAPOLIS (410) 260-2200 • FAX (410) 263-9158 • TDD - Use MD relay or 711 • www.annapolis.gov
Chartered 1708

October 22, 2015

Theodore Henry, Project Manager
gsxsolutions
7 Old Solomons Island Road
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Review of the September 1, 2015 Forest Conservation Plan (FCP), Lot 4 at Bay Village

Mr. Henry,

Following are comments from the Department of Neighborhood and Environmental Programs regarding the FCP for Lot 4 at Bay Village:

1. Sheet FC 1:

   Forest Conservation Worksheet:
   - B: Why is the Public R/W not included in the Net Tract Area?
   - Use the conservation threshold and the afforestation threshold for the high residential areas (20% and 15% respectively)
   - The City prefers a reduction of the forest area that will be cleared. Any Forest Conservation Plan Justification Statement for a site with Priority Stands will need to answer the questions in section 3.1.1 part 4 on page 3-6 of the State Forest Conservation Technical Manual, Third Edition 1997. Please show the projected canopy coverage for afforestation/reforestation areas.

2. Sheet FC 3:

   The six Sycamore trees proposed along Bay Ridge Avenue will be planted on Anne Arundel County property. Please provide documentation that the County is aware that trees are being planted in their right-of-way and that they will be maintained and protected in an approved landscape plan.

   Some of the proposed planting locations for large canopy trees are too small. Either enlarge the planting area or use a smaller type of tree.

   Some of the proposed planting locations for large canopy trees are too close to underground utility lines. Trees must be outside utility easement areas.

   As it pertains to the Forest Conservation Act no square footage can be claimed for the planting of shrubs.

Sheet FC 4:

Root prune at the LOD and place the silt fence in the pruning trench.

Delete the tree protection fence detail in the bottom left corner.

3. Concept Landscape Plan:

   Please show the scale on the plan.

   Many of the proposed large canopy trees are in inappropriate locations (too close to retaining walls/utility lines, etc).

Stormwater Management:

1. Page 3 of the SWM Report states HSG soils of C and D are present on the site. The computations on page 7 do not show any D soils.

2. The computations on page 19 show the SWM requirements after ESD. The following comments are in regards to the BMP on site:
   a. The calculations do not seem to take into consideration the ESD practices proposed for this project in calculation of volume required for treatment.
   b. The calculations for ESDv do not include impacts to existing micro-bioretention areas being impacted by this development.
   c. It is noted that the pond may be oversized and the volume may already be accounted for.

3. It is unclear in Appendix D if the pond computations are the original pond computations or if they are revised to the new design of the pond.

4. On page 64 of the SWM Report shows 3.47 acres of offsite impervious area and 0.75 acres of onsite impervious area to the pond. On sheet C16 the offsite impervious area is shown to be 6.08 acres for existing and 7.88 acres for proposed.

5. On page 65,the WQv shown as 5659 CF does not match the existing plans on sheet 31 in the SWM Summary table, which shows the WQv to be 8,957 CF required with 5,508 CF in the SWM permanent pool.

6. Updated borings are required for this project.

7. The retrofit of the existing pond is removing the micro-bioretention area closest to the outfall of the stormdrain to the pond. This micro-bioretention area is connected to a stormdrain system which includes the overflow from the other micro-bioretention area being a part of the system. This connects to the last manhole prior to the outfall to the pond. This pipe appears to be impacted by the new design of the pond.

8. The retaining walls to the pond will be in the permanent pool of the pond and will be 12 feet high. This wall will have a high likelihood of failure from hydrostatic pressures.

9. The outfall from the proposed stormdrain system does not show any riprap or stabilization at the outfall. The outfall is shown to be approximately 4 to 5 feet above the invert of the pond. This outfall could undermine the footer of the wall.

10. The pond needs to be designed to NRCS-MD Code No. 378 Pond Standards and Specifications.
11. A safety bench may be needed for the pond.

12. The plans on page C12 show an existing fence, which is not in the location shown.

13. The proposed fence along the wall does not go all the way along the wall.

14. The Time of Concentration Path shown for drainage area 1A in the existing and proposed conditions is shown going through the wetland and flowing uphill.

15. The erosion and sediment control plans are showing staging and stockpile areas on top of the proposed locations for micro-bioretention areas 1, 2, and 8. This may cause compaction of the soil.

16. The erosion and sediment control measures show a temporary sediment trap on top of micro-bioretention areas 6 and 7.

17. The temporary sediment trap is shown on the northern side of the site. On the southern side of the site (adjacent to the pond), the only sediment and erosion controls are reinforced silt fence shown going through the footprint of the building, through the wall and along the top of the existing BMP.

18. Please provide detailed information regarding the existing stormwater pond and the areas it is intended to service.

Prior to your submission of any revisions, please contact me to schedule a pre-application meeting.

Sincerely,

Frank Biba

Frank Biba, AICP, LEED AP
Chief, Environmental Programs\
Dept. of Neighborhood and Environmental Programs
fjb@annapolis.gov
410 263-7946

cc: Maria Broadbent, Director DNEP
Pete Gutwald, Director P&Z
Terry Schuman, P. E.